



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing to Israel's sufferings in exile) and never as future, while his glorification and success in revealing Jehovah to the heathen are always presented as in the future and in close connection with the release from captivity which the prophet conceives of as near at hand (*cf.* 49:5, 6; 50:8); (4) that the difficulties of interpretation occasioned by the conception of the Servant as an individual all disappear when we consider him a personification of the nation and make the consequent allowance for allegorical, figurative representation; (5) that the lack of any unified representation of the Servant is possible in the case of a personification, but not of a concrete individual; (6) that the suffering, death, and subsequent glorification of the Servant described in Isaiah, chaps. 49-54, is a striking representation of Israel's sufferings in exile, resulting in national death, with the restoration to honor and the triumph over the false gods involved in the return from exile.

This is probably the strongest presentation yet made of the argument for the identification of the Servant with Israel as a whole, and will do much to counteract the present tendency toward the adoption of the conception of the Servant as an individual, which is represented by Duhm, Sellin, and an increasing number of scholars.

JOHN M. P. SMITH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language. By PROFESSOR GUSTAV DALMAN. Translated by D. M. KAY. I: "Introduction and Fundamental Ideas." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. xi+350. \$2.50.

Professor Dalman, who is so widely and favorably known on account of his studies in theology and semitics, has here given some of the results of years of study and research. To the student of theology the results set forth will be of great interest, but they will also be of interest to all who seek a minute knowledge of Scripture. This volume is dedicated to the endeavor to find out what were the actual words which Jesus spoke and what was the content of meaning contained in them. In order to attain this end Dalman has laid under contribution, not only the New and Old Testaments in Greek and Hebrew, but also the apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, targums, literature on the law, Midrashim, liturgical works of post-biblical writings, and the Aramaic language.

In the introduction, of nearly one hundred pages, the way is cleared for the study of the fundamental ideas of Jesus by answering certain questions as to the language used by the Jews of Jesus' day and as to the language used by Jesus himself. Aramaic and not Hebrew is shown to have been the language spoken by the Jews of Palestine, from the custom, represented in the second century after Christ as very ancient, of translating into Aramaic the text of the Hebrew Pentateuch in the synagogue of the Hebraists of Palestine; from the Aramaic titles for classes of the people and for feasts attested by Josephus and the New Testament; from the use of the Aramaic language in the temple; from old official documents in the Aramaic language; from the language of public documents; from the unquestioned adoption in the time of Jesus of the Aramaic characters in the place of the old Hebrew in the copies of the Bible text; from the syntax and the vocabulary of the Mishna; and from the custom of calling Aramaic "Hebrew."

From these considerations the conclusion must be drawn that Jesus grew up speaking the Aramaic tongue, and that he would be obliged to speak Aramaic to his disciples and the people in order to be understood. Since, then, Jesus spoke in Aramaic, his sayings would be reported in that language for the use of the "Hebraists;" and though the literary language of the Jews has always been Hebrew, still there is much to justify the view that a collection of the sayings of our Lord designed for the "Hebraists"—in other words, a primitive gospel (*Urevangelium*)—was written in Aramaic. Since, then, Jesus spoke in Aramaic and his words were reported in that language, it is in Aramaic that the "Hebraisms"—better the "Semitisms"—of the gospels must be sought, from which must be separated the "Græcisms" of the gospels, *i. e.*, those linguistic phenomena which have no immediate Semitic equivalent, and for which, therefore, the Hellenistic writers must be held responsible.

In order to inaugurate an investigation of the synoptic Semitisms, fifteen of them are examined, and it is found that the genuine Hebraisms are almost exclusively peculiarities of Luke, and that it is *in the discourses of Jesus that the distinct Aramaisms are found*. Several have sought to prove (and have thought themselves successful) that the primitive gospel was written in Hebrew. According to Resch, the three synoptists merely made a different selection and arrangement of the same Hebrew material. But upon examination of Resch's proofs Dalman comes to the conclusion that the special Hebraisms of the

synoptic gospels are of Greek origin, that the attempts hitherto made to infer a Hebrew original from the variants in the gospel texts are unsuccessful, and that signs are not wanting to show that the authors of our gospels, in their present form at least, were not conversant with the Hebrew language.

Apart from the testimonies of Eusebius, there are no certain traces of the existence of a primitive gospel in a Semitic language. But it is really an Aramaic, not a Hebrew, original of Matthew that is attested by the ancient tradition; for in all the notices the emphasis is not laid on the fact that Matthew wrote in Hebrew as opposed to "Syriac," but only on the fact that he composed his work in the language peculiar to the "Hebraists." Anyone who, like Eusebius, is convinced that the mother-tongue of the "Hebraists" was Aramaic, can think of no other language in this connection.

Many have attempted to restore the Aramaic gospel, and Wellhausen believes that the Aramaic form of it has been established; but Dalman can see no more than a high probability for an Aramaic primary gospel, as the existence of such a gospel lacks convincing proofs. Since the proofs of a Hebrew written source are equally inconclusive, one must return to the consideration that the occasional agreement of the synoptists in Greek expressions implies that the documentary sources used by them were Greek, and the Semitisms, so far as they are not biblicisms, are due to the *Aramaic oral archetype*.

These points being settled, the problem is not to make a mere Aramaic translation of the words of Jesus as given in the synoptists, since it is the untranslatable which is to be made intelligible. Nothing but a running commentary seems adequate to the end in view, namely, to investigate in what form the words of Jesus must have been uttered in their original language, and what meaning they had in this form for the Jewish hearers. As to the language itself, it will be the Galilean dialect, for which the most important criteria are the Targum of Onkelos, and the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim.

On the basis of these conclusions Dalman takes up certain of the fundamental ideas of Jesus: the sovereignty of God, the future age, the world, the "Lord" as a designation for God, the Father in heaven, other divine names, evasive or precautionary modes of referring to God, the Son of man, the Son of God, Christ, the Son of David, "the Lord" as a designation of Jesus, Master as a designation of Jesus; and gives us an illuminating commentary on each. In this book we have a good example of that minute exegesis into which each

one must penetrate as far as possible if he would understand Jesus himself. This study is especially apropos at a time when men are endeavoring to understand the teaching of Jesus unmediated by the minds of his followers. Although one is aware that the book is a translation, there are no places where one feels that the translator has left the author's meaning obscure.

HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE,
Washington, Pa.

Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By
FREDERIC G. KENYON, Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts,
British Museum. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901.
Pp. 321. \$3.25.

Dr. Kenyon's book is in some ways the best introduction to the textual criticism of the New Testament that has yet been given to English readers by an English writer. It gives a clear and beautifully written account of the materials which the textual critic uses, an adequate account of the work which has been done in the past, down to the time of Westcott and Hort and their successors, and a sketch of the general lines on which textual criticism is progressing.

But even in the best books there is always something which strikes anyone who is himself working on the same subject as open to criticism, and Dr. Kenyon's book is no exception.

It is surely a great mistake to have adopted Scrivener's old notation for the minuscules. It is most annoying for the student to find that the book, which has been given him as an introduction to a subject naturally complex, adds to its complexity by a system which speaks (for example) of Cod. Evan. 473, when nine out of ten scholars in England or America and all scholars in Germany speak of Cod. Evan. 565. Scrivener's notation is dead; it ought to be buried; and its appearance in Dr. Kenyon's pages is only that of an unhappy and undesirable *revenant*.

Another point on which Dr. Kenyon's book does not carry conviction to me is his treatment of the problem of the "Western Text." He quite admits, of course, that the Western Text has greater claims to consideration than Westcott and Hort allowed, but he does not bring out the fact, which is the really dominant one in the whole problem, that the Western Text has obtained its present importance just because it is no longer possible to describe it accurately either as "western" or as a "text."